

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.
—AFFILIATED—
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF DAY NURSERIES, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XV, No. 7

BULLETIN
OCT 28 1937

SEPTEMBER, 1936

"Children are among God's greatest gifts to creation. All else appears as nothing alongside a little child . . . It is the children who bring joy and a guarantee of happiness to the world. When their cries and laughter disappear, you will know the Judgment Day has come to mankind."—HIS EMINENCE, PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES

Intake—Who Shall Do It?

[The following statement embodies excerpts from a paper prepared by the staff of the Juvenile Aid Society of Philadelphia. The paper summarizes a long series of staff discussions on the subject of a local intake policy, but the questions it raises are pertinent to any situation in which the intake of a child care agency is not done by the agency itself.

In the particular community under discussion the intake is done by the family welfare agency. In many communities, intake is being done through the medium of a family agency or a clearing bureau which serves as the intake department for all the child caring agencies in a given community set-up. This paper raises the question as to the validity, purely from the case work point of view, of any plan in which intake is not done by the agency receiving the child into care.

The question of intake is at the fore in many communities. It is important to throw light upon it from many sources. The Child Welfare League of America prints the following statement in the hope that it may be provocative of thought and further discussion.]

THE Juvenile Aid Society has attempted to define, in terms of modern case work principles, the relation of its intake procedure to the cases of children who themselves, or whose parents, or both, have not accepted the separation that has taken place. These cases stubbornly resist all the most thoughtful efforts to effect a successful adjustment, be it in an institution or a foster home, because of the difficult relationships which develop between parents, children, agency and foster parents.

Examining and diagnosing such cases of failure, we find that, generally speaking, they have in common fundamental elements that defy us from the outset. There are those children who must be subjected repeatedly to needless removals from one foster home to another because of the interference of their parents. There are those children, rejected by their parents and torn between their own and foster parents, who are unable to relate themselves to foster parents throughout the period of placement. There are those children whose neurotic parents

deftly manoeuvre placement to serve their own purposes, as well as to influence the child in his ability to relate positively to the agency or foster parents.

Who can unravel the plight of the illegitimate child, not sufficiently freed by his mother to permit an adoption plan, nor sufficiently wanted to find a permanent place in his own mother's affection? What are the hopes for success with children of divorced or separated parents who play the children against each other and against all of placement?

AFTER using the best skills and techniques and sparing no labor or money in a desperate effort to achieve something better for all these children, an evaluation of our processes led us back inevitably to the same point—*intake*. It seemed evident that an array of discouraging placement incidents was being fruitlessly manipulated by child care agencies whose probable opportunity for success was hampered because they had no participation in a relationship with the parent at the time he asked for his child's removal from his home.

(Continued on page 2)

Coffers For Service

"In a year of intense political interest I want to emphasize an issue that is above party and politics. The meeting of human needs is still the most compelling appeal in our country. On this platform citizens of all parties unite irrespective of political differences. I am glad to head an organization that calls on all good Americans to come to the aid of their less fortunate fellow men."

—GERARD SWOPE, National Chairman
1936 Mobilization for Human Needs

Case Work in a Day Nursery

EDNA PYKE

ONE outstanding development of social work in the past few years has been the use of the most skilled people at the application point. This step was taken after studies showed that the client often becomes conditioned for or against an organization on his first contact, particularly because he has come needing help with some problem.

Trained case workers have been interviewing almost all applicants for care from the Cleveland Day Nursery Association, and our experience has convinced us that the application interview is as important in day nurseries as has already been demonstrated in other social agencies.

In our organization the same worker who interviews the applicant follows up any treatment indicated. We have found this easier for the client than a transfer to another worker or agency. Some of the advantages we had found in having a case worker see applicants are: (1) We have a more complete picture of the child's social and emotional life and can give more individualized care in the nursery; (2) treatment of parents can begin at once on whatever level indicated. We believe we are making it possible for children to gain much more from the nursery experience and are making a greater contribution to community welfare.

Intake—Who Shall Do It?

(Continued from page 1)

Placement of children under the most favorable circumstances, with the best of skills, with the finest community resources, is a hazardous undertaking. Add to it, however, the handicap of any intake system which functions in contradiction to modern case work principles, and the successful placement of the conflicted child is a virtual impossibility.

The plan which our community has been following for many years makes the family agency the investigating medium for the child care agencies. It is based on the principle that the family agency is the most important child care agency in the community because it has large numbers of children in care, because it has the resources and skills for keeping families together, and because the desire on the part of a parent or relative to have a child cared for away from its own home is regarded as a symptom of a family problem which may best be treated by some form of family case work. The basic premise of the

plan is that no child should be removed from his own family until every effort has been made to keep the home from falling apart.

Theoretically, this is a good plan, and we would not belittle the sanctity of home in its sociological significance. We recognize, moreover, that children belong in families, and preferably in their own families. As case workers, we know indisputably that children develop best when they have an opportunity to form relationships and sink their roots within a family unit. But even this concept, fine as it is, may be dramatized, sometimes, out of all proportion to reality.

We have learned to recognize that some homes are well advanced in self-destruction before they finally break down. Of what value is a home, gradually self-destroying, to a child who is being rejected either obviously or in a more cruel, subtle fashion by a depriving or over-solicitous parent, or to a child whose emotional balance has been undermined by repeated threats of placement? Of what value are abstract theories which stress keeping a home intact but which sometimes fail to take cognizance of the basic forces of disintegration that may be depriving a child of the ability to grow normally in his own home?

A parent's request for the placement of his child, unless made in the face of obvious social dilemma, such as illness or death, should indicate first that placement may be necessary and only second that it may be worth while to keep the home intact, if it has been determined that the factors leading to the request for placement are not detrimental to the child's relationships in his family. In other words, a parent's request for placement is a strong indication that all is not well in the home, but we must think more of safeguarding the child's right to develop normally than of seeking to bolster a home, the sanctity of which may be more mythical than real.

We believe that this shift of emphasis is fundamental in any case work analysis of the effect of intake upon the subsequent treatment of the child. We believe that the child care agency, whose primary concern is the welfare of the child, is more directly related to the placement problem of the parent than is a family agency.

ONE fundamental principle of present-day case work is that the client must assume responsibility for the processes he sets in motion when he takes the

(Continued on page 5)

New Legal Ruling in Adoption Cases

CHARLES E. DOW

A STRIKING decision in an adoption case has been handed down recently by the Supreme Court of Minnesota. It is a decision that breaks with all precedents and lays down a principle that if followed in other jurisdictions will have wide implications. Social workers, especially children's workers engaged in placement for adoption, will be interested in it.

A long line of decisions by courts of final jurisdiction in many different states holds that where a method of adoption has been provided by statute, adoption cannot be effected in any other way than by the statutory method. The recent Minnesota decision goes contra to this rule and holds that where no court action to adopt a child has been taken in accordance with statutory provisions, nevertheless conduct and admissions may express a contract which creates the relationship of parent and adopted child.

THIS is the story of the case. A child three years of age was being cared for in 1896 in the Bethany Home in Minneapolis. His parentage was unknown to the Home, but it is believed that his parents perished in a great forest fire. William A. Firle and his wife, Mary, seeking a child for adoption, came to the Bethany institution. They were attracted to this little boy and took him home with them.

The attitude of the Firls toward the new member of their family from that time on was the attitude of parents toward a son. They took him to their church and there had him baptized under the name of his foster father, William A. Firle. They told the minister upon this occasion that they had adopted the boy. They announced to their friends that they had adopted him. They continually referred to him as their son. William Firle, the elder, took out upon the boy's life an insurance policy in which he designated himself as father. They did not let the boy know he had not been born to them.

When the younger William grew up, steps were taken to teach him a trade. Thereafter he turned over most of his earnings to his foster parents. When the World War came he served as a soldier in the American army. The elder Firle and his wife received as parents an allotment from his pay as a soldier. Later he married and when the marriage ended in divorce, the custody of his five-year-old

child was awarded to the elder Firle and his wife as the "grandparents." Also after the divorce young Firle returned to live with his foster parents. He took care of the Firls during illness as a son might be expected to do.

There was evidence also in the case that it was the custom of Bethany Home to require persons to adopt children when they took them from the Home. However, the Firls never did adopt by any court proceeding the boy they took from Bethany Home and whom they treated through the following years as their son.

Mary Firle died, following the death of her husband, and left no will. Her four sisters thereupon came into court, denied that William Firle was her lawful heir, on the ground that he had never been adopted, and claimed for themselves as heirs her property, amounting to about \$8,000.

It was in this way that the case reached the Supreme Court in Minnesota. That court, laying down a new principle of law in regard to adoptions, says in part in its opinion:

"The facts set out above all indicate that there was an agreement to adopt respondent. They repeatedly stated that they had adopted him. . . . We are of the opinion that the status of William as an heir was properly before the Probate Court and *that conduct and admissions expressed a contract which created the relationship of parent and adopted child.*"

It is not for child welfare workers to question or perhaps even to comment upon the legal soundness of this decision. They may, however, express pleasure that Minnesota's highest court did not permit legal technicalities to thwart the manifest purpose of foster parents, nor to deprive a foster child of his share in the property of those to whom he had been in all essentials a son—property which probably he had assisted them materially in accumulating.

The Private Agency

" . . . we must have the private agencies to run along in front, set standards, conduct experiments, and otherwise add life, tone, and vitality to the social program."

—H. V. BASTIN

BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America and the National Federation of Day Nurseries.

C. C. CARSTENS, Editor
FLORENCE M. PHARO, Assistant Editor

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00 Single copies, 10c.
Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

The Function of the Maternity Home

THE part that maternity homes should play in the social work mechanism of our cities and states is perhaps more misunderstood than that of any other units.

Some of the earliest maternity homes were established as Magdalen societies by boards of trustees consisting entirely of men, and most of these societies were designed by their charters for the so-called "fallen" girl.

With the change in the attitude on the part of the general public toward the unmarried mother, service to her has come to be directed more toward giving her good medical care and life in a kindly atmosphere in preparation for her confinement than toward her reformation. This emphasis has led maternity homes to equip themselves particularly for good obstetrical service, and hospitals have been built and so well equipped in certain cities by maternity homes that they compare with the best maternity wards in general hospitals.

But the unmarried mother and her child need so much more than good medical care. The young mother not only needs training for the care of her child, if she desires to keep it, but she also needs more education and training than most unmarried mothers have when they come to maternity homes. In addition, she needs to be helped to a sane adjustment to the life that lies before her, with appropriate religious training.

Some maternity homes are now also becoming interested in the whole problem of the unmarried mother in their respective communities and are interested in being of service to them whether or not they have ever come into maternity homes.

A good maternity ward in a general hospital can supply good obstetrical care and is usually better equipped than maternity homes are for difficult

obstetrical service. The social adjustment service for the unmarried mother and her baby a hospital cannot so easily supply.

The justification for the existence of the maternity home is that it aims to be a social service agency for the better equipment of the unmarried mother and the task that lies ahead—an agency that will assist her to make the right decisions as to whether she should keep the baby and not attempt to make them for her, or have her make them when she is physically or mentally in no position to do it wisely. If a maternity home is not equipped with the kind of staff that can render this service, its principal function is likely to remain unperformed. If in addition to this service it can also provide obstetrical care of a high order, no objection can be raised to such a program.

The appeal of the maternity home for its support by the public is as a social agency. How many can qualify as such?

—C. C. CARSTENS

Case Record Library

IN response to repeated requests from many sources, the Child Welfare League of America has devoted considerable time during the past year to the matter of social case records.

We are attempting to gather together a sampling of current case work practice the country over. It has not been our wish to secure so-called model records, as they are seldom typical of those in an average case load, but rather to collect chapters of case work showing interesting processes, types of service rendered, methods of recording, and so on.

Member agencies of the League have been most helpful in the working out of this plan. We have only a small beginning but hope to add continually new samplings to the group. We shall appreciate constructive criticism and further suggestions from members who have records they feel would be of particular interest for this purpose. To be practical they must be comparatively short. In all instances the client's identity is, of course, safeguarded by fictitious names. The records are unedited.

Because of the expense involved we have as yet mimeographed only three records:

Number 1. Baumgarten: A foster home investigation.

Number 2. Sibilio: Care of a cardiac child in own home and foster home.

Number 3. Lassa: Institutional care and family rehabilitation.

Each member agency of the League may secure a copy of each record without charge, upon request. To help defray the cost of mimeographing and mailing, we are charging 25 cents a copy for any additional copies, and to those who are not members of the League. In quantities of 10 copies or more, there will be a discount of 10 per cent.

Besides the mimeographed records we have others in typewritten form which may be read in the League office, or will be sent out in response to special requests for certain types of material if they appear to meet the need.—SYBIL FOSTER, Field Secretary, Child Welfare League of America.

Intake—Who Shall Do It?

(Continued from page 2)

initial and positive step of arriving at the social agency on his own momentum. It then becomes the obligation of the agency to help him to a fuller and more complete solution, while he himself undertakes the responsibility for working it out.

The most valuable asset in any case work situation is not the rule of thumb mechanics of agency set-ups, no matter how flexible they may be, but the client himself, his strengths, his aggressions, his desire to work out a solution for the difficulty he has at the time. This primary principle is violated when we propel him into any agency not directly related to the problem as he sees it.

A parent wishing to place his child would usually seek a child care agency, but if that agency does not do its own intake, he learns that he must apply to another agency, possibly a family agency. Thus the client, who sees his problem as that of placing his child, would find himself at the application desk of what he recognizes as a relief agency. Even when he learns that the family agency provides services other than relief, he nevertheless is liable to some confusion as to the reason why he is offered these services, instead of the one he is seeking. The family worker, on the other hand, has the two-fold problem of orienting the parent and, if the community plan demands it, of helping him in various ways to keep his home intact.

Therefore we find that from the very beginning he may be prevented from solving his problem in the positive way which he himself initiated. His aggression is shut off by an overwhelming will, a force outside himself and greater than himself—the community philosophy and machinery. He is frustrated because his own plan and the power behind it,

sufficient to carry him to a social agency in his first attempts to solve his own problem, are deviated and turned back upon him by something stronger than himself, yet, as he sees it, so foreign to his problem.

He may, thereupon, stop his dynamic output and become entirely dependent on the family agency, satisfied that the force which was greater than he, bear the burden of solving his problem for him. Hence, he surrenders his positive attack on his problem at a point where it should be constructively utilized in helping him to solve it. He may then become the parent who relinquishes his child too hastily or too easily, so that the subsequent relationship of the family and child care agencies with him and his child is unnecessarily crippled and a successful placement is handicapped. He may, on the other hand, not give up so easily. He may feel that his own plan for his child and family is what he wants and must have. If he is not given the leeway to carry it through, he will do everything he can to hinder the working out of alternative plans.

The child care agency inevitably feels the effects of such an attitude when it has to begin its contact with the parent. In any case, something which could have been used as a positive force in building up the future relationship with parent and child now becomes a potentially destructive force.

WHEN a child care agency does not do its own intake, the first introduction to parents and child may take place on a day when they have undergone a number of new and harassing experiences. On this day, they may have appeared at the bar of the court; the child possibly has received a final physical examination; parent and child may meet the child care worker and the new foster family, or the staff and children of the institution, for the first time. The child enters a new environment that has in it not one familiar element to which he can cling.

Does not this kind of introduction lay open the worker and agency to being blamed by the child for uprooting him from his family? Worker, agency and foster home, or institution, then become the focus for the projection of his natural resistance to separation from familiar surroundings.

If the placement worker is to go on with the child, and he must, we can see how much unnecessary blocking he has to overcome at a critical point in the child's adjustment to placement. The parent, too, who has borne very little of the responsibility for the placement plans after his initial application, may project his emotional conflicts onto the worker,

agency and foster home. Because we have found that these things happen and interfere with the success of the case work processes in placement, we question the basic value of any plan for intake done outside the child care agency.

If, however, the child care agency is at liberty to do its own intake, it is taking an important step toward predisposing its entire job to a more successful outcome. The very fact alone that a parent, seeking to place his child, would at once enter the office of a child care agency rather than some intermediate agency, permits of beginning a real case work job.

Up to the point of his entrance into the office, we must assume that certain processes have taken place within the client. He has recognized some problem; he has decided to do something about it, and from a field of possible resources, he has selected the type of agency he thinks can help him with his problem. As he walks into the office, a relationship begins, qualified constructively by the fact that he has come himself and the fact that he has chosen this particular agency, so directly related to the problem as he sees it.

When the client and child care agency come together for the first time, the agency accepts him in a non-judgmental way. It acknowledges his right to choose the type of solution he wishes for his problem as he sees it, but offers him a frank portrayal of agency limitations. Thus the client is met with reality as regards the manner in which the agency can help him with his difficulty.

In the process of rejecting or accepting agency limitations, the client has the opportunity to clarify and test his emotional capacity to bear the kind of separation from his child that placement means. Then, whether he consents to use the agency with all its limitations, or whether he decides that he cannot bear the limitations, his decision is made on the basis of an inner reality produced by his coming to grips with an outer reality which only the placement agency can present concretely to him. He has understood and faced both, and has been left free to make his own choice. Having done this, he has taken the responsibility for and precipitated the ensuing course of events. In other words, his aggressions and strengths are being utilized to the utmost in attaining his own solution for his own problem—a problem which may now appear different to him from the way he saw it as he entered the child care agency's office.

The agency has merely assisted in the process

by directing the use of his own dynamic forces in a way that brings some satisfactions to him. Therefore, the client does not feel frustrated or guilty, and has no need to project destructive emotions onto the agency which continues with his child. The client and agency have entered into a relationship based upon mutual acceptance, and thus the treatment of the child which will soon begin is not unnecessarily blocked by those unresolved conflicts centering about the initial separation from his child.

Moreover, the process of the parent's releasing the child, having passed a vital stage at the first point of intake, continues in the period during which placement is carried out. The actual placement of his child in a particular foster home or institution is again a reality which may threaten the parent and to which he will react emotionally. These reactions, unless worked through with the help of the child care agency, become a potential danger to the child's adjustment to a new environment, at the very time the child needs most skillful help in achieving new relationships.

If the child care agency has developed a relationship with the parent during the first period of emotional stress, and if he has taken responsibility for the placement plan, then the agency, by continuing in the relationship, can help him get through the second period. Only if that happens can we safeguard the child's adjustment to foster home or institution.

UNTIL we are enabled to enter the intake process with the client at the very beginning, we shall strive on unsuccessfully to create satisfying placements for certain children. We therefore question whether the child welfare agency, any more than other case work agencies, can function effectively if its contact with its clients does not begin until after plans, which are supposedly the solution to the client's problem, are already under way.

The Adopted Child

THE ADOPTED CHILD, by Eleanor Garrigue Gallagher. A John Day book, published by Reynal and Hitchcock, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 291 pages. \$2.50. *Note:* Due to wide interest in this subject, and the fact that this book is one about which child welfare workers will wish to be informed, the Child Welfare League of America is welcoming further comments on the various phases touched upon by the author.

THIS book deals primarily with the questions which may be asked by prospective foster parents, and secondarily "with other problems which must be

faced by all those who are concerned in any way with the adoption of children." The treatment is confined to the subject of the "white child in infancy." As a large number of the infants available for adoption are born of unmarried mothers, the author gives special attention to the problems involved in this group. The percentage of illegitimate births mentioned in her book is higher than is found in other places.

In her first chapter Mrs. Gallagher reviews the procedure for adopting children in the principal countries of the world. The subject of "Heredity and Environment" is naturally treated at length. The author evidently feels that the educational environment and training as furnished by the foster parents may be expected to develop the adopted child as normally as one born in the home. Of course, the giving of a defective child for adoption is to be avoided by the use of every safeguard that the present state of science suggests. There is a chapter on "Intelligence Tests in Adoption" which shows the safeguards which have been devised. The author feels that these should be given only when there are indicative symptoms on the part of the child. Other chapters deal with "Illegitimacy" and "Unmarried Mothers." Mrs. Gallagher, as a result of her own experience in child placement, advocates the use of the "adoption nursery" in preference to any other method of obtaining children for adoption. She gives a detailed description of the practices or technique of The Cradle, in Evanston, Illinois.

If a child is under observation by pediatricians, trained nurses and psychologists for a considerable time in an adoption nursery, the information so obtained should be valuable. It would have been well if the author had left the length of this period less vague. A few days would not be sufficient. Too many times a child is simply put into the hands of prospective foster parents by persons who consider only the fact that a child is desired.

ONE of the recommendations of the author is highly controversial. It is that the child's history, touching questions of birth, and so forth, should not be given to prospective foster parents. She expects them to have complete faith in the investigation made and the conclusions reached by the adoption nursery when they are told that they are receiving a "suitable child." To one who has handled a great many adoptions and many family problems of maladjustment this appears to be asking a great deal of prospective foster parents.

In this book the treatment of the investigation of foster parents is very brief. Each foster parent is supposed to furnish references—doctor, clergyman, reliable business friends, *et al.*—and the nursery writes to these for confidential information. In addition there are personal interviews at the nursery. Here the difficulty is the trustworthiness of so-called confidential letters. Certainly information gained by interviews of an experienced social worker with the "references" would be both more complete and reliable. A full knowledge of the foster parents, including the characteristics of their home surroundings and life, should be obtained.

Only in this way can the element of personality, so important in this business of living one with another, be understood. Possibly it is this lack of sufficient consideration for the element of personality that leads the author to give such decided preference to the particular methods of child placement which she advocates. This may account also for the absence of emphasis upon individual treatment in the case of the unmarried mother. Mrs. Gallagher feels that for the sake of the child the unmarried mother should make the supreme sacrifice of giving up her baby almost immediately after confinement. . . .

AFTER several years of experience with adoptions I have received a bird's-eye view of the problem as it appears here and there all over the state, in both rural and industrial sections. Various states have equally varying conditions. The education and training of probate judges vary; their general experience varies. For all these reasons, rather generally expressed, I feel that the state boards of control which arrange that every adoption in the state be carefully investigated, and that recommendations be made to the judges, in the various localities, is really a good plan for the protection of the child. Mrs. Gallagher apparently does not feel this way, but I think perhaps she did not consider it from a state-wide point of view.—MARGARET G. BOURNE, Consultant, Probate Court, County of Cuyahoga, Cleveland, Ohio.

In Current Magazines

HARPER'S BAZAAR, August, 1936. "Wanted—Unwanted Baby," article on adoption by Margaret Case Harriman. This article follows closely the newly published book, "The Adopted Child."

TRUE STORY MAGAZINE, serial story beginning in August, 1936, issue, "I Was an Unmarried Mother"—as revealed to Dr. Robert South Barrett, President of the National Florence Crittenton Mission. (Continued in September and October Issues.)

Transfer of Dependent Persons Between States

FOR the improvement of standards in the support of both children and adults, the Committee on Interstate Problems has formulated a "Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act" for recommendation to all states. This Act may be found in full in the July, 1936 issue of *Public Welfare News*, issued by the American Public Welfare Association, 850 East 58th Street, Chicago. The suggested Act is given, in part, as follows:

Section 1. (Reciprocal Agreements.) The (Department of Public Welfare), subject to the approval of the Attorney-General, is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with corresponding state agencies of other states regarding the interstate transportation of poor and indigent persons, and to arrange with the proper officials in this state for the acceptance, transfer, and support of persons receiving public aid in other states in accordance with the terms of such reciprocal agreements; provided that this state shall not nor shall any county or other political subdivision of this state be committed to the support of persons who are not in the opinion of said (Department of Public Welfare) entitled to public support by the laws of this state.

Section 2. (Uniformity of Interpretation.) This act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the laws of those states which enact it.

Section 3. (Short Title.) This act may be cited as the Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act.

Beyond the Walls of Group Life

ALERT leaders providing institution care for children have kept close to the stream of community life, says Miss Sybil Foster, field secretary, Child Welfare League of America, in a bulletin issued by the League in July, entitled "The Coordination of Institution Care for Children and Other Services in the Community."

After presentation of material designed "to develop a concept of the modern institution as it is of use today—the institution which may be looked upon as one of the valuable tools of case work, necessary in the community if we are to have a comprehensive program for child care," Miss Foster takes up many questions affecting institutions and their children, including the forms of service an institution well may render today and the interplay of its activities with those beyond its walls.

The text of this bulletin was presented by Miss Foster in May at the National Conference of Social Work, Atlantic City. A supply of the pamphlet is now available at the League office, at 15 cents a copy. (A copy was sent to each member agency of the League in July.)

Elements of Sound State Public Welfare Program

1. The integration of state public welfare services in one effective and non-political state department of public welfare.
2. The integration of local public welfare services under one effective and non-political local public welfare department, organized on a county or district basis.
3. The application of the civil service merit system to state and local public welfare employees.
5. Rewriting the state's welfare laws in terms of today.

—ARTHUR DUNHAM

J.V.S and A.P.W.A.

AN experiment in joint planning for personnel in governmental welfare agencies was begun on August 1 by Joint Vocational Service and the American Public Welfare Association. Mrs. Ella Weinfurther Reed has assumed the position of liaison personnel secretary for the two agencies. She will be the special consultant on personnel questions coming from public officials and from social workers interested in positions in the government social services.

League Directory Changes

ILLINOIS.—Springfield: Children's Service League of Sangamon County. Miss Dorothy F. Puttee, Executive Secretary, succeeding Miss Mildred Ames.

GEORGIA.—Atlanta: State Department of Public Welfare. Henry B. Mays, Jr., Director.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Harrisburg: Department of Welfare. Miss Rosemary Reinhold, Chief, succeeding Miss Mary S. Labaree.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Wilkes-Barre: The United Charities (omit Child Welfare Department). Substitute name of John B. Middleton, Executive Secretary, for Miss M. Eleanor May, Case Supervisor. This is also listed under branch offices of Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania.

WISCONSIN.—Madison: Juvenile Department, State Board of Control of Wisconsin. Address correspondence to new offices, Room 425, Bank of Wisconsin Bldg., Monona Avenue and West Main Street, Madison.

Enclosure

(Sent to League Member Agencies Only)

MEETING NEEDS OF CHILDHOOD—printed folder giving some facts about The Michigan Children's Aid Society, 4612 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan.